DCI/ICS 85-3011 1 October 1985

| MEMORANDUM FOR:    |   | 25X1          |
|--------------------|---|---------------|
|                    | Executive Secretary, CIA                                      |               |
| FROM:              |   | 25X1          |
|                    | Executive Officer, ICS  |               |
| SUBJECT:           | Response to Action on C-5A Reprogramming                      |               |
|                    |   | 25 <b>X</b> 1 |
|                    | attached recommendation from our LL Office, I propose that no |               |
| rormal, interim re | esponse be sent to Representative Addabbo persuant to his     |               |
| letter of 5 Septem | nber 1985. If you concur, we will convey assurances relevant  |               |
| to the congression | suggests, and provide   | 25X1          |
| requested cost dat | a to the Committee (with copies to ER) when that information  |               |
| becomes available. |   | 25 <b>X</b> 1 |
|                    |   |               |
|                    |   |               |
|                    |   |               |
|                    |   |               |
|                    |   |               |

Attachment: As Stated

cc: LL PBS

THIS MEMORANDUM MAY BE DOWNGRADED TO UNCLASSIFIED UPON REMOVAL OF TS/B ATTACHMENT.

EO/ICS 10/01/85)

25X1

30 September 1985

| Го:      | EXO/ICS  |
|----------|--|
| From:    |  |
| Subject: | Tasking in Response to HAC Language in<br>Letter Approving a Reprogramming for |

John - I just saw this & I wish I could have passed along the following before you sent out the attached tasking. I had a conversation with Bob Davis and John Plaschal of the HAC staff about this. Their feeling was that there were several "obvious" (to them) questions about this reprogramming that should have been anticipated; yet, no one seemed to have a good handle on all of the background attendant to this reprogramming. They eventually got the information they were seeking when another HAC staffer happened to be at an Air Force installation and asked the right question of the right people. Messrs Davis & Plaschal said that it was obvious that people were trying to be cooperative, and there was no perception on their part that anyone was "stonewalling" the Committee on this; it just seemed like there wasn't a very good job done in coordinating and scrutinizing this request before it got to the Committee. I'm not sure a formal response is either called for, or wise in this instance. I think the better course might be to informally assure them that we hear what they're saying, that we do try to anticipate the Committee's questions, and that we appreciate the feedback & will stay on top of these actions. Your thoughts?

STAT

STAT

STAT

85-1/14 Approved For Release 2009/09/02 : CIA-RDP86M00191R000300640013-9 SECRETARIAT LOGGED ROUTING SLIP 2 4 SEP 1985 IC STAFF **Routing Slip** DATE ACTION INFO INITIAL TO: INFO COORD ACTION 1 DCI • 2 DDCI Χ EO/ICS 3 EXDIR D/ICS 4 D/ICS X DD/ICS 5 DDI EA-D/ICS 6 DDA 7 DDO SA-D/ICS X 8 DDS&T SA-D/ICS-EP 9 Chm/NIC CIPC 10 GC U 11 IG χ 12 Compt PPS 13 D/OLL X 14 D/PAO COMIREX 15 VC/NIC SIGINT 17 HUMINT 18 FIPC 19 IHC . 20 21 **SECOM CCIS** SUSPENSE **SECRETARIAT** FLC To 4: Please prepare appropriate response to AS request for additional information (w/copy to ER). REGISTRY STAT **DDCI** SUSPENSE: 1 Oct 85 23 Sept 85 3637 (10-81) request and send info cope

